

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年報

平成13年度  
(第5号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2001

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2002・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2002

# Some Philological Remarks on and around Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)*

Akira YUYAMA

## 0. Prefatory:

0.0. It has been somehow my cherished desire to study this text from various viewpoints, even though I am no specialist in Tāntric literature. In the first place my private interest arises from the text that is a Buddhist iconological work. In any case Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha* has been drawing my attention for the past few decades. I am ashamed to confess here, therefore, that I have so far made no progress in this direction, as my own pace is slower than a snail's. This paper is thus intended to be a preliminary survey of the text. It is merely an indication of my wish to study it in the future. At all events, I have no intention to investigate it from the religio-philosophical point of view.

0.1. In the second place, the author of this text seems to have been versed in the teachings of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. In his enlightening article Gustav Roth concludes after a careful comparison of the two that Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha* is a modified version of the *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana* belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins.<sup>1</sup> Needless to say, however, it is a different question whether or not he belonged to that school. At this stage it is almost impossible to judge if he was a Lokottaravādin. Furthermore, the question of whether the school had actually survived until his time will still remain unsolved, unless there appears definitely reliable evidence to prove it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gustav Roth, "Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa according to the Tibetan version of the Caitya-vibhāga-vinayodbhāva-sūtra, the Sanskrit treatise *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana*, and a corresponding passage in Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha*", *The Stūpa: Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*, edited by Anna Libera Dallapiccola in collaboration with Stephanie Zingel-Avé Lallement (= *Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung*, LV) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980), p. 196.

This article is fortunately included in his collected papers: *Indian Studies: Selected Papers by G. Roth*, edited by Heinz Bechert and Petra Kieffer-Pülz, published on the occasion of his seventieth birthday (= *Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica*, XXXII) (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1986), p. 264. — cf. *infra* n. 43.

0.2. It may be further noted here that Nalinaksha Dutt has seen in it some Vinaya elements of Mahāyāna Buddhism.<sup>2</sup> I believe, however, that this issue must be carefully reviewed. It may be necessary to collect more materials in this category.<sup>3</sup>

0.3. In any case, if Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha* is a text in the lineage of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, it will be highly important to examine its linguistic features, whether grammatical or glossarial. So far the language of that school is entirely written in the so-called Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. It goes without saying that the language he had used is one among other complicating factors in determining his position.

0.5. Before going on to tackle these problems, I would herewith like to make a brief critical survey of this peculiar literature.

### *I. Indic Original in Old Manuscripts:*

1.0.0. Kuladatta had been known as the author of the *Kriyāsamgraha*(-*pañjikā*), consisting of eight chapters (*prakaraṇas*), the last being on the stūpas.<sup>4</sup> It was in 1882 that Rajendralal Mitra introduced it for the first time in his monumental work.<sup>5</sup> He had found it in two manuscripts not always intelligible (*op.cit.*, p. 109 / p. 107). This work may afterwards have not attracted the proper attention of specialists for some time.

1.0.1. In his well-known catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts kept in the Asiatic Society of Bengal at Calcutta, Hara Prasād Śāstrī paid the careful attention to this rare text and gave more detailed information of the

---

<sup>2</sup> See Nalinaksha Dutt, "Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa Sūtra", *Indian Historical Quarterly*, VII, 2 (Calcutta 1931), p. 259-286, esp. p. 262-264. — cf. Charles S. Prebish, *A Survey of Vinaya Literature* (Taipei: Jin Luen Publishing House, 1994), p. 129f. cum n. 3 (p. 141)!

<sup>3</sup> On some texts related to the Vinaya of this school see A. Yuyama, "Some Remarks on Two Texts Related to the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins", *Festschrift Albrecht Wezler on the occasion of his birthday 02 March 2003* (Hamburg-Heidelberg, in the press).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. e.g. *New Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*, edited by V. Raghavan, IV (= *Madras University Sanskrit Series*, XXIX) (Madras: University of Madras, 1968), p. 234b-235a, *Kuladatta*, s.v. — cf. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Rajendralal Mitra, *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1882; reprinted by Cosmo Publications, New Delhi, 1982), p. 105-109: Nos. B23 (palmleaf) [= Haraprasād No. 79] & B10 (paper) [= Haraprasād, No. 80?]; retypeset edition with an introduction by Alok Roy (Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1971), p. 103-107. — cf. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 7.

contents of the two manuscripts. One of them is a palm-leaf manuscript numbered 79. According to Hara Prasād, seventeen folios are missing out of 176 of this manuscript. He makes a further note that it is incomplete at the end. In fact, he guesses that it is copied in the Newārī character of the sixteenth century. It is a great pity that this manuscript seems to be missing Chapter VIII.<sup>6</sup> This is a manuscript copied in Patan in Samvat 373 and has been carefully verified for 1252 CE.<sup>7</sup> This manuscript offers another interesting fact. Since it is an incomplete manuscript at the end, the colophon is missing and therefore no date is obtainable from it. A paper manuscript copied from it and kept in St. Petersburg bears the so-called *Pratīyasamutpāda-gāthā*<sup>8</sup> and the colophon reading the date.<sup>9</sup> It means that this manuscript may well have been a complete one when the secondary copy was made on paper.<sup>10</sup>

1.0.2. Speaking of an incomplete manuscript, I am wondering if another old palm-leaf manuscript kept in the University Library at Cambridge may well be on the same lineage. It bears the title *Kriyā-pañjikā* of Kuladatta. Unfortunately, it is an incomplete manuscript. The date is estimated to be XIII-XIVth centuries.<sup>11</sup> These two must doubtlessly be very important from the

<sup>6</sup> Hara Prasad Shāstri, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection, under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, I: *Buddhist Manuscripts* (Printed at the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, 1917), p. 119-126: No. 79/3854 (palmleaf), p. 126f.: No. 80/4728 (paper). — cf. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> For further details see Luciano Petech, *Mediaeval History of Nepal* (c. 750-1482). Second, thoroughly revised edition (= *Serie Orientale Roma*, LIV) (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1984), p. 85: No. 22.

<sup>8</sup> On the *Pratīyasamutpāda-gāthā* see my article: 湯山明, “十二因縁観覺え書き”, *印度學佛教學研究*, XX, 1 (Tokyo 1971), p. 448(48)-444(52).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. for details N. D. Mironov', *Katalog' indijskix' rukopisej Rossijskoj Publičnoj Biblioteki. Sobranie I. P. Minaeva i Nekotoryja Drugija. Vypusk' I: Izdanie Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk'* (Petrograd': Tipografija Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk', 1918), p. 269-271: No. 287. — cf. Klaus Ludwig Janert, *An Annotated Bibliography of the Catalogues of Indian Manuscripts*, I (= *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, Supplementband I) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1965), p. 123: No. 262.

<sup>10</sup> For further details see Luciano Petech, *Mediaeval History of Nepal* (c. 750-1482) (= *Serie Orientale Roma*, X) (= *Materials for the Study of History and Culture*, III) (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1958), p. 88: No. 18.

Cf. also Dilli Raman Regmi, *Medieval Nepal*, Part I (Early Medieval Period 750-1530 A.D.) (Calcutta: K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1965), p. 216: No. 19.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Cecil Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge* (Cambridge at the University Press, 1883), p. 183f.; No. Add. 1697-I. — cf. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 13.

viewpoint of textual studies.

1.1.0. There seem to be quite a few old palm-leaf manuscripts kept in various places. In carrying out historical studies of Nepal the dated manuscripts always offer indispensable source materials for establishing chronology.

1.1.1. The oldest manuscript is the one in the Field Marshal Kaisher Collection in Kathmandu: No. 109. In 1956 Gadjin M. NAGAO (長尾雅人) made an investigation into this collection in collaboration with Masaaki HATTORI (服部正明). Later on he published a preliminary report on it. This manuscript is recorded therein.<sup>12</sup> As usual, Luciano Petech has recorded the colophon carefully and verified it for Thursday, 11 February 1216 during the reign of King Arimalla (CE 1153-1216, r. 1200-1216, less possibly 1200-1231?):<sup>13</sup>

*samvat 336 māgha-kṛṣṇa-saptamyām bṛhaspati-dine / śrī-rājādhīrāja-paramēśvara-  
parama-śrīmat- [Regmi: śrīmad-] Arimalla-devasya vijaya-rāje [read °-rājye?]   
pustakan̄ likhitam iti //<sup>14</sup>*

1.1.2. It may be noted here that a Japanese specialist named Mitsutoshi MORIGUCHI (森口光俊) made an energetic investigation in 1975 in search of Tāntric Buddhist manuscripts and published his research fruit in a catalogue. It offers the texts in Indic alphabetical order with their original catalogue numbers, microfilm numbers at the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (= NGMPP) as well as facsimiles of a certain amount of manuscript folios. He lists ten manuscripts of the *Kriyāsaṃgraha(-pañjikā)* of Mahāpañdita-Kuladatta (NGMPP: No. D.2531; cf. *infra* §4.2). Four out of them are palmleaves. The palm-leaf manuscript, kept formerly in the Kaisher Library, is also recorded in his catalogue.<sup>15</sup>

1.2.0. Among some five items held in the National Archives of Kathmandu is

<sup>12</sup> 長尾雅人, “カトマンドゥの仏教写本典籍”, 岩井博士古稀記念・典籍論集 (東京・東洋文庫, 1963), p. 11: No. 109. — cf. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 11.

<sup>13</sup> On the early Mallas and the manuscript materials during this period see e.g. Sylvain Lévi, *Le Népal: Étude historique d'un royaume hindou*, II (= *Annales du Musée Guimet: Bibliothèque de vulgarisation*, XVIII) (1905) [Reprinted by Asian Educational Services, New Delhi-Madras, 1990], p. 214. — cf. Petech, *Mediaeval History of Nepal* (c. 750-1482) (Roma 1958), p. 84f.; his second thoroughly revised edition (= SOR, LIV) (1984), p. 82.

<sup>14</sup> See Petech, *op.cit.* (1958), p. 84; his second revised edition (1984), p. 81.  
Cf. also Regmi, *Mediaeval Nepal*, Part I (Calcutta 1965), p. 206.

<sup>15</sup> Mitsutoshi MORIGUCHI, *A Catalogue of the Buddhist Tantric Manuscripts in the National Archives of Nepal and Kesar Library* (Tokyo: Sankibou Busshorin, 1989), p. 30: No. 111 - C109 (189 folios).

the second oldest dated palm-leaf manuscript (No. CA-318: 146 folios) written in the then fashionable Bhujimo script during the reign of King Abhayamalla (CE 1183-1255, r. 1216-1255; cf. Petech, *op.cit.*, 1st ed. 1958, p. 89, 2nd ed. 1984, p. 86). It seems to have formerly been kept in the Durbar Library. Thanks to the painstaking efforts of Moriguchi, the colophon of this manuscript has become available in facsimile. It is now clear without doubt that "This is the book belonging to Vajrācārya Udayaśrīka", as noted also by Regmi (*op.cit.*, I, p. 212):<sup>16</sup>

(146a2) *samvat 337 jyeṣṭha-śukla-pūrṇa-māsyām soma-dime / (.3) śrī-rājādbirāja-parameśvara-parama-bhaṭṭāraka-śrīmat Abhayamalla-devasya vijaya-rājye likhitam iti //<sup>17</sup> o // vajrācārya-udayaśrīkasya pustako <'>yam // o //*

After this colophon reads a 2-line memorandum in a very modern bad hand. Unfortunately, it is illegible on the photo. It looks nothing but a scratched scribble.

1.2.1. It is verified for Monday, 22 May 1217 CE.<sup>18</sup> To my regret, I have yet seen none of those manuscripts. They are all very important both in the history of Nepal and in Buddhist philology. Sylvain Lévi directed his attention to this period on the basis of the manuscripts in his well-known work (*op.cit.*, II, p. 214f.). According to the well-known chronicle *Gopālarājavamśāvalī*,<sup>19</sup> King Arimalladeva reigned for 25 years and 10 months, and Abhayamalla 42 years and 6 months. Based on a palm-leaf manuscript Dilli Raman Regmi (\*1926) published a reliable edition of this text.<sup>20</sup> And a very interesting new edition with facsimiles of this manuscript has appeared, thanks to the painstaking effort of Dhanavajra Vajrācārya (\*1932) and Kamal

<sup>16</sup> See Moriguchi, *op.cit.*, p. 30 (a description of No. 111: 10 MSS) & 31 (a reproduction of Ms ca-318: folios 145b & 146a).

<sup>17</sup> The colophon of this manuscript is available up till here in: *Nepāla-rājakīya-Vīra-Pustakālayastha-pustakānām Brhat-sūcīpatram, yasyāyam bauddha-viṣayakaḥ saptamo bhāgah, tasyāyam prathama-khandah* (= *Purātattva-Prakāśana-Mālā*, XXXX) (1962), p. 121; Kramāṅkah CA 318 / *Viṣayāṅkah* 186.

<sup>18</sup> See Petech, *op.cit.* (Roma 1958), p. 85; and its second edition (1984), p. 83; also Regmi, *Medieval Nepal*, I (1965), p. 212f.

<sup>19</sup> For a brief but updated comprehensive survey of chronological literature of Nepal see Theodore Riccardi, Jr., "The *Nepālarājaparamparā*: A Short Chronicle of the Kings of Nepal", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, CVI, 2 (1986), esp. p. 248a, n. 6.

<sup>20</sup> D. R. Regmi, *Medieval Nepal*, Part III: *Source Materials for the History and Culture of Nepal 740-1768 A.D. (Inscriptions, Chronicles and Diaries etc.)* (Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1966), Appendix B: *Gopal Vamśāvalī*, p. 121: folio 25b3-4: ... *rājā śrī-Arimaladeva varṣa 25 mā 10 ... ... // rājā śrī-Abhayamaladeva varṣa 42 mā 6 ...*

P. Malla (\*1936).<sup>21</sup>

1.2.2. The paper manuscript in the Raghu Vira Collection is no doubt a recent copy of the very Kathmandu manuscript. Fortunately, Sharada Rani has photomechanically reproduced it with a brief bibliographical note.<sup>22</sup> In the colophon it clearly mentions the dates of the original scribe and of the later copyist (*op.cit.*, p. 281.6-282.2):

(281.6) // *samvat 337 jyeṣṭha-śukla-pūrṇa-māsyāṁ soma-dine śrī-rājādhīrāja-parameṣvara-(282.1)parama-bhaṭṭāraka-śrīmat Abhayamalla-devasya vijaya-rajyāṁ [sic: °-rājye?] likhitam iti // // vajrācārya-udaya-śrīkasya pustako yaṁ // // śubham astu // // likhiteyāṁ [sic] yaśodharā-mahā(.2)vihārāvasthita-śukrarāja-vajrācāryena [sic] idāṁ pustakāṁ sampūrṇa<m> likhitam // // puna 1085 samvat jyeṣṭha-māse kṛṣṇa-pakṣe budha-vāsare likhiteya [sic] samāptam //*

1.2.3. I am not at all competent in chronology. It is clear at least, however, that it was copied on Wednesday (*budha-vāsara*) in the dark half (*kṛṣṇa-pakṣa*) of the Month of *Jyeṣṭha* (i.e. May) in 1085 (i.e. circa 1965 CE). The copyist Śukrarāja Vajrācārya is certainly related to the famous Yaśodhara Mahā-Vihāra in Patan.<sup>23</sup>

1.3.0. It is a pleasing matter in these years to see this Tāntric work drawing considerable interest from those scholars engaged in the relevant fields.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Dhanavajra Vajrācārya and Kamala P. Malla, *The Gopālarājavamśāvalī: A facsimile edition prepared by the Nepal Research Centre in collaboration with the National Archives, Kathmandu. With an introduction, a transcription, Nepali and English translations, a glossary and index* (= Nepal Research Centre Publications, IX) (Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1985), fol. 25b3-4.

<sup>22</sup> *Kriya-Sangraha: A Sanskrit Manuscript from Nepal containing a Collection of Tantric Ritual* by *Kuladatta*, reproduced by Sharada Rani (= *Śatapiṭaka Series*, CCXXXVI) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1977), (iii), 282 pages (in Arabic numerals alone). No folio number is given. In a usual manner it may therefore be counted as 141 folios.

<sup>23</sup> Unfortunately, I have not yet identified who the copyist Śukrarāja Vajrācārya is. Here-with, however, I refer to the following two elaborate books on this very old Vihāra:

*Yaśodhara Mahāvihāra Samgha* (Lalitpur: Lotus Research Centre, 1993), xv, 220, 17 p., 2 col.-frontisp., 39 ills. (photos), plans. This book records a number of inscriptions.

John K. Locke, *Buddhist Monasteries of Nepal: A Survey of the Bābās and Babīs of the Kathmandu Valley*. With photographs by Hugh R. Downs (Kathmandu: Sahayogi Press Pvt. Ltd., 1985), Patan Area No. 16 (Spot No. 31 on the folded map of Patan): p. 154a-159b (incl. a photo No. 103 on p. 155), and a sketch plan of buildings (between p. 156-157), cum n. 152-160 (on p. 493b-494a).

<sup>24</sup> For further details about this text see an indispensable survey made by Munenobu SAKURAI (桜井宗信) in *A Descriptive Bibliography of the Sanskrit Literature*, IV: *The Buddhist Tantra*, edited by Keisho TSUKAMOTO, Yupei MATSUNAGA & Hirofumi ISODA (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1989), p. 195-197 (in Japanese).

Tadeusz Skorupski has recently made a great service to understand this literature as a whole, making a good use of Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* published in facsimile under the editorship of Sharada Rani (cf. *supra* §1.2.0-3). Skorupski has offered an indispensable analytical summary of this very difficult text. It is to be much regretted, however, that Chapter VIII of my chief concern is rather too briefly treated.<sup>25</sup>

1.3.1. From various points of view Skorupski has convinced us of the date of Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)*, saying: "... it may be assumed with some confidence that it was composed in the second half of the eleventh century." (Skorupski, *op.cit.*, p. 181). I fully agree with him. Furthermore, it is really interesting, therefore, that his work had begun to spread among the population in manuscript form in Nepal soon after the composition. It is eloquently attested by quite a few old manuscripts, which have survived until today (cf. *supra* §1.1.1 & 1.2.1).

1.4. Almost at the same time Ryūgen TANEMURA has brought a revised version of his M.A. thesis submitted to the University of Tokyo in 1993. It is a critical edition of Chapter VII of Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* by collating ten manuscripts, six of them being copied on palm-leaves.<sup>26</sup> One of them consisting of 146 folios (dated Samvat 337) and bearing a signature "N" by Tanemura, is said to be kept in the National Archives of Nepal consisting of 146 folios (dated Samvat 337). It may well be the one treated above (cf. *supra* §1.2.0-3 & 1.3.0). However, he gives no reference to Sharada Rani's edition. It is hoped that in the nearest future he will give us the benefit of more careful textcritical treatment. Incidentally, Tanemura has just published an enlightening article on the consecration ceremony (*[pratimā-]pratiṣṭhā*) on the basis of Chapter Six of Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha-pañjikā*.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Tadeusz Skorupski, "An Analysis of the *Kriyāsamgraha*", *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen (= *Indica et Tibetica*, XXXV) (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1998), p. 181-196.

<sup>26</sup> See e.g. *Kriyāsamgraha of Kuladatta: Chapter VII*, edited by Ryugen TANEMURA (= *Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica*, VII) (Tokyo: The Sankibo Press, 1997), (ii), 63 p.

<sup>27</sup> Ryugen TANEMURA has given a detailed analysis in his painstaking work: "One Aspect of the Consecration Ceremony of Images in Buddhist Tantrism: 'The Ten Rites' Prescribed in the *Kriyāsamgraha-pañjikā* and Their Background", *Journal of the Japanese Association for South Asian Studies*, XIII (Tokyo, October 2001), p. 52-75 (with a Japanese summary on p. 248). — Extensive bibliographical information is to be found on p. 73-75.

## II. Tibetan Version:

2.0. Here again it is interesting to see that the *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* of Kuladatta reached the land of snow at considerable speed. It was translated into Tibetan by Grags-pa rgyal-mtshan (Kirtidhvaja) probably in 1279: ed. Peking Tanjur No. 3354: *Bya-ba bsdud-pa žes bya-ba*, i.e. *Kriyāsamgraha-nāma*: ŠI 260a4-420a6 (= 1957 Tokyo-Kyoto Reprint Edition, LXXIV, p. 160.2.4-170.2.3);<sup>28</sup> Derge edition = Tohoku Catalogue No. 2531: KU 227b1-362a7.

2.1. Bu-ston (1290-1364) has naturally recorded this text in his famed catalogue (1322 CE): Text No. 1869 (Tohoku Catalogue No. 5197).<sup>29</sup> This phantom-like book has at last appeared, thanks to the painstaking efforts of Lokesh Chandra and Soshū NISHIOKA.<sup>30</sup> Soon after that the late János Szerb (†1988) left a very painstaking editorial work on it with utmost care.<sup>31</sup> He has given extensive bibliographical remarks on various editions (*op.cit.*, p. XIII-XV). Only a few copies seem to have escaped his attention, e.g. three copies brought back to Japan by Enga TERAMOTO (and others).<sup>32</sup> Until then we had owed much to the English version rendered by Evgenij Evgen'evič Obermiller (1901-1935) on the basis of the Bkra-śis lhun-po edition.<sup>33</sup>

2.2. As for the Tibetan version of the Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha*, Skorupski has used the Peking edition (cf. Skorupski, *op.cit.*, p. 181 n. 4), while Tanemu-

<sup>28</sup> For further details see "Otani Tanjur Catalogue", i.e.: *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Tanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka ... Otani University*, I, 3 (Kyoto 1977), p. 511; or Palmyr Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, II: *Index du Bstan-bgyur* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale – Ernest Leroux, 1909), p. 265: LVII.16.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism*, edited by Yen-sho KANAKURA, Ryujo YAMADA, Tokan TADA and Hakuyu HADANO (Published by the Seminary of Indology, Tohoku University, Sendai, 1953), p. 72b: No. 5197 [Ya. 1-212].

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *History of Buddhism: Tibetan Text*, edited by Lokesh Chandra from the Collections of Raghu Vira (= *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, XXIV = Ya) (= *Śatapiṭaka Series*, LXIV) (New Delhi 1971), folio 185b6-7, or p. 1002.6-7); Soshū NISHIOKA, "Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu-ston's 'History of Buddhism' (III)", *Annual Report of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange, University of Tokyo*, VI (Tokyo 1983), p. 80: No. 1869.

<sup>31</sup> János Szerb, *Bu-ston's History of Buddhism in Tibet. Critically edited with a comprehensive index* (= *Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens*, V) (= *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse*, DLXIX) (Wien: Akademie-Verlag, 1990), p. 106.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *Catalogue of Tibetan Works kept in Otani University Library* (Kyoto 1973), p 287: Nos. 11841-11843.

<sup>33</sup> *History of Buddhism (Chos-bhyung)* by Bu-ston, Part II, translated by E. Obermiller (= *Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus*, XIX) (Heidelberg in Kommission bei O. Harrassowitz, Leipzig, 1932), p. 224.

ra used both Peking and Derge (cf. ed. Tanemura, p. 17). From all the dated documents there seems to be no room to doubt that Kuladatta composed the *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* in the second half of the 11th century CE, as convincingly argued by Skorupski (*op.cit.*, p. 181).

2.3. Further investigation into other sources in search of another version or recension of Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* in Tibetan is yet expected. However, there may be no chance to find one. Needless to say, I must be very careful in making a hasty conclusion. At least, the date of his activities makes us assume that his work has not reached the Tunhuang area.

### ***III. Kriyāsamgraha as a Material on Caitya-/Stūpa-Cult:***

3.0. As mentioned above, Gustav Roth concludes that Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha* is a modified version of the *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana* belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins (see *supra* §0.1 cum n. 1). This text will then be an indispensable work on the *stūpa-/caitya-cult* in writing at our disposal. This is most interesting from various viewpoints. On this question I have discussed in my recent paper.<sup>34</sup>

3.1. Bénisti has given a critical edition of the relevant portion from Chapter VIII of the *Kriyāsamgraha-pañjikā* of Kuladatta with a French translation and detailed commentary on the basis of the two manuscripts kept in the National Library of Paris (*op.cit.*, p. 89-108).<sup>35</sup> The accumulated results of her work were fully displayed in her monographic publication.<sup>36</sup> Incidentally, Nalinaksha Dutt used one of these two manuscripts in his article mentioned above (cf. *supra* §0.2). To my regret, I have not yet verified which one he had consulted.

3.2. It is sincerely hoped that this kind of work will attract more students in Indology and Buddhology among my younger compatriot scholars. I have emphasized the desirability of it before (see e.g. *ARIRIAB*, IV: 2000/2001, p.

<sup>34</sup> A. Yuyama, "Some Remarks on Two Texts Related to the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins", *Festschrift Albrecht Wenzel* (in press), §2.0 and the following.

<sup>35</sup> These two modern manuscripts are catalogued with detailed notes by Jean Filliozat, *Catalogue du fonds sanscrit*, Fascicule I (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale / Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1941), p. 17: No. 31 (dated 1833 CE), and p. 18: No. 32 (around 1836 CE).

<sup>36</sup> See e.g. Mireille Bénisti (avec une préface d'André Bareau), *Contribution à l'étude du stūpa bouddhique indien: Les stūpa mineurs de Bodh-Gayā et de Ratnagiri* (= *Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, CXXV) (Paris: ESEO – Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1981), I: Text, XII, 158 p.; II: Illustration, XIV p., 169 figs., 1 carte:– "Répertoire des œuvres citées", I p. 145-150.

70, regarding Siegfried Lienhard's remarkable work in and on Nepal). It is pleasing, therefore, to cite herewith just one brief but interesting article written out of the field works with regard to the *stūpa-/caitya-cult* among the Newars today (cf. *infra* §6.8 cum n. 58).<sup>37</sup>

#### *IV. Some More Dated Palm-leaf Manuscripts:*

4.0. After all Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* seems to have been rather popular among the Buddhists particularly in the Himalayan regions. Quite a few old palm-leaf manuscripts have thus survived to date. The abundance of older manuscripts give us bright future for textcritical tasks and new editorial work. I would like, therefore, to record some of these important manuscripts. In addition to the above-mentioned old palm-leaf manuscripts, I will list the dated manuscripts briefly in chronological order with references.

4.1. The University of Tokyo Library holds seven complete manuscripts (Nos. 112-118), out of which three are palmleaves: No. 115 (Samvat 503), No. 116 (Samvat 624), and No. 117 (Samvat 385). The first two were brought back by Ekai KAWAGUCHI 河口慧海 (1866-1945). And Junjirō TAKAKUSU 高楠順次郎 (1866-1945) brought back the third, i.e. the oldest one.<sup>38</sup> Unfortunately, their full colophons are not given in this catalogue. Thanks to the painstaking efforts of Luciano Petech, it is now verified for 8 October 1265 during the reign of Jayabhīmadeva, offering the colophon in full:<sup>39</sup>

*samvat 385 aśuni-badvi-trayodaśyām rājādhirāja-śrī-jayabhīmadevasya vijaya-rājye.*

4.2. In 1910 Ryōzaburō Sakaki 樺亮三郎 (1872-1946) brought back over one hundred manuscripts from Nepal. His strong interest seems to have been laid in Tāntric and narrative literature. Among them is a complete palm-leaf manuscript of the *Kriyāsamgraha-pañjikā* of Kuladatta. It is classified under the category of Tāntric literature in the Kyoto University Collection.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> 吉崎一美 (Kazumi YOSHIZAKI), “ネワール仏教の仏塔建立について (On the Establishment of Caityas in Newar Buddhism)”, 密教図像 / *Journal of Buddhist Iconography*, IX (Kyoto 1991), p. 15-25 (from the back), incl. 2 photos and 1 ills. (in Japanese).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*, compiled by Seiren MATSUNAMI (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1965), p. 48-50 & 355.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Petech, *Mediaeval History of Nepal*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (1984), p. 94: No. 4.

<sup>40</sup> *A Succinct Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Possession of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University*, compiled by Kiyotaka GOSHIMA and Keiya NOGUCHI (Kyoto: Society for Indic and Buddhistic Studies, Kyoto University, 1983), p. 7. — cf. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 14.

4.3. There are many more paper manuscripts of the *Kriyāsamgraha-pañjikā* of Kuladatta. Owing to a limited space, I would omit them here. As is well known, every scholar in the related fields of study is indebted to the Nepal-German Manuscript Project team under the leadership of Albrecht Wezler of Hamburg at present. They have microfilmed thousands of manuscripts held in the Kathmandu Valley region.<sup>41</sup> In the most recently published catalogue five complete and two incomplete manuscripts in paper have so far been microfilmed and kept in the National Archives of Nepal.<sup>42</sup> However, as a matter of fact, more manuscripts had been microfilmed as of 1987 (cf. *supra* §1.1.2). There may be far more than that number by now. It is my cherished desire now to see if more hitherto unknown old palm-leaf manuscripts are preserved in microfilm.

#### *V. Concluding Words in Brief:*

5.0. The *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* of Kuladatta is indeed an interesting text, but not an easy one. It is hoped, therefore, that the specialists in the related fields of study will join the group to try to approach the text from various different angles. It is most fortunate that the original text is available in good manuscripts. The prime necessity is to have a critically edited text to invite serious philological work.

5.1. It will be a future task to see how much Kuladatta played a role in Tibet. It is a great pity, therefore, that Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* seems to have not reached the land of the Chinese, nor the Tunhuang area (cf. *supra* §1.3.1 & 2.3). So far I have not found traces of it among the corpus of Chinese Buddhist literature.

5.2. Indo-Tibetan iconographical literature does not seem to have reached pre-mediaeval Japan (cf. *infra* §5.4). The iconological, iconometrical and iconographical literature has since attracted considerable attention of serious scholars to date. It is hoped that Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* will become a central figure in the related fields of study in the future.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. x & 17.

<sup>42</sup> They are conveniently recorded with film numbers: *Sūcīpatra (Buddha Viśayakā Hastalikhit Granthaharūko)*, Bhāg I, by Jagannāth Upādhyāya & Śukadeva Śarmā Jñavālī (with a foreword by Sāṇīmāimyā Rānā) (= *Abhilekha-Prakāśana-Mālā*, V) (Kathmandu: Rāṣṭriya Abhilekhālāya, 1997), p. 87: "Nepāl-Jarman Hasta-likhit Grantha Samrakṣaṇ Pariyojanābāt Māikrophilm bhaekā Bauddha Granthaharū":- complete manuscripts: Nos. 316-317, 320-322, and incomplete ones: Nos. 318-319.

5.3. Furthermore, historians of Buddhist ideas with a firm philological background can now play an active role. Without their participation such a difficult text will not be fully understood. After all, I hope that the *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* of Kuladatta will invite a number of young and promising scholars to study it from various viewpoints. There exist also a number of other interesting texts within the framework of this genre. Herewith I would like to add some more random remarks on the relevant literature.

#### *VI. Additional Notes:*

6.0. In addition to Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)* mention may be made to Bhadravyūha's *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana*. In the first place Gustav Roth paid heed to this text belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins as early as 1968.<sup>43</sup> In connection with this text I have discussed the *stūpa-/caitya*-cult in icons and writings in my previous article (cf. *supra* n. 3). Two more minor texts related to the dimensions of *caityas* and images in fragmentary manuscript form kept in the University Library of Cambridge: Bendall's *Catalogue* numbered Add. 1706.VI (13 folios) and Add. 1706.VII (2 folios). Neither of them escaped Roth's attention (*op.cit.*, p. 32).

6.1. With regard to the *stūpa-/caitya*-cult in writing I would like to add one of the most interesting works published in recent years.<sup>44</sup> In close relation to the *stūpa-/caitya*-cult one cannot forget the literature on the measurement of images, particularly of Buddhist statues. In this connection mention may be made to Hans Ruelius, who made a brief but very useful general survey of the relevant literature within the framework of his research into the Indian *Śilpa-śāstras*.<sup>45</sup> There is an interesting text named the *Buddha-pratimā-lakṣaṇa*

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Gustav Roth, "Remarks on the Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecanam", *Professor Syed Hasan Askari Felicitation Volume* (= Supplementary Issue to: *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*) (Patna 1968), p. 31-46. Unfortunately, this enlightening article is not included in his collected papers (Delhi 1986). — cf. *supra* § n. 1 end.

<sup>44</sup> Ratna Handurukande, *Three Sanskrit Texts on Caitya Worship in Relation to the Aborātravṛata. An edition and synopses in English (with an introduction)* (= *Studia Philologica Buddhica: Monograph Series*, XVI) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2000), (viii), xxv, 132 p. — on some related literature see her "Bibliography", p. 130f. (esp. Dargyay 1978, Handurukande 1978, Iwamoto 1958, Rajapatinara 1974).

<sup>45</sup> Hans Ruelius, "Some Notes on Buddhist Iconometrical Texts", *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*, LIV, 1-4 (Patna 1968), p. 168-175.

A summary of this survey is included in his doctoral thesis: Hans Ruelius, *Śāripura und Ālekhyalakṣaṇa: Zwei Texte zur Proportionslehre in der indischen und ceylonesischen Kunst* (Diss. — Göttingen 1974), p. 16-18: §2.1.4 "Die buddhistischen ikonometrischen Texte".

and its commentary *Pratimā-lakṣaṇa-vivaraṇa*. A palmleaf manuscript is kept in the University of Cambridge Library: Bendall's *Catalogue* numbered Add. 1706.III (7 folios) and IV (17 folios, missing the last leaf). As for the *Buddha-pratimā-lakṣaṇa*, there seem to be yet two more manuscripts in paper at the University of Kyoto: Goshima-Noguchi's *Succinct Catalogue* (p. 20 with reference) numbered 70 (15 folios) and 71 (16 folios).

6.2. Needless to say, this relevant literature is beyond the scope of my present paper. I would therefore like to refer just to a detailed bibliographical survey carried out by the late Jan Willem de Jong (1921-2000).<sup>46</sup> He has made a thorough observation on every work related to the literature in Indic, Tibetan and Chinese as well as a number of studies in Japanese.

6.3. After all, a *stūpa / caitya* is an architectural product. It is thus simply related to a "dwelling, housing" technique or science, i.e. *vāstu-vidyā*. Therefore, I cannot help mentioning a recent development of this branch of science. A hitherto less-known text named *Mayamata* has appeared before us.<sup>47</sup> Its English version translated by Bruno Dagens is most welcome.<sup>48</sup>

6.4. Another exciting publication in recent years is a text based on a palmleaf manuscript copied in Simhala script. Three Sri Lankan scholars have brought it out together with detailed studies including a facsimile of the manuscript.<sup>49</sup> This interesting work will no doubt invite specialists to further our knowledge.

<sup>46</sup> See J. W. de Jong, "Bibliographie ad Š. Bira, *O, Zolotoj knige' S. Damdina* (Ulan Bator 1964)", *T'oung pao*, LIV, 1-3 (Leiden 1968), p. 173-189, esp. p. 180f.

For the sake of convenience, mention may be made to a practically unavailable article by Ryōzaburō SAKAKI cited by de Jong is now included in his collected papers (retypeset):

榎亮三郎論集 (東京・国書刊行会, 1980), p. 229-252: = "佛説造像量度經の梵本研究", 藝文, VII, 3 (1916), p. 250-264, and IX, 3 (1918), p. 251-267

<sup>47</sup> A meticulous survey is carried out by David Pingree, *Census of the Exact Sciences in Sanskrit*: Series A, Volume 5 (= *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society held at Philadelphia for Promoting Useful Knowledge*, CCXIII) (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1994), p. 278a-279a: "Maya" (with extensive bibliographical reference).

<sup>48</sup> *Mayamata: An Indian Treatise on Housing Architecture and Iconography*, translated by Bruno Dagens (New Delhi: Sitaram Bhartia Institute of Scientific Research, 1985), (xi), xlvi, 389 p. (incl. 35 figs).

<sup>49</sup> *Mañjuśrī Vāstuvidyāśāstra: Romanized Transcript with a Tentative Edition, English Translation and Studies*, by M. H. F. Jayasuriya, Leelananda Prematileke & Roland Silva (= *Bibliotheca Zeylanica Series*, I) (Colombo: The Archaeological Survey of Sri Lanka - The Central Cultural Fund, 1995), vii, 322 p. (incl. photomechanic reproduction of the palmleaves on p. 23-34; and ills., figs., and a comparative table of 4 *Śilpa-sāstras*).

6.5. Herewith I would just quote one more relevant work published with a detailed introductory essay, annotations and an illustrated glossary. This text has been preserved in three manuscripts. It offers a lot of useful information.<sup>50</sup> Needless to say, it is out of our scope here to discuss the origin of the Buddha's image. At the moment our concern is how the iconometric technique has developed in India. In this regard the *silpa-vidyā* within the framework of paintings cannot be neglected.<sup>51</sup>

6.6. It is well known that Mgon-po skyabs (工布查布) translated the Tibetan version of a significant work on Buddhist iconometry into Chinese during his stay in Peking in 1742, i.e. 造像量度經 (Taisho No. 1419).<sup>52</sup> He must have played a great role for a short period of stay in the capital city.<sup>53</sup> It seems to have been printed in the thirteenth year of Emperor Ch'ien-lung (乾隆帝: 1711-1799, r. 1735-1795), i.e. 1747. This is yet another interesting example that the Chinese version translated by Mgon-po skyabs has since attracted the population quickly in China and its surrounding regions of East Asia due to the earnest wish and urgent need.<sup>54</sup>

6.7. Incidentally, I would herewith like to cite two more recent publications, which has appeared after a useful survey made by J. W. de Jong (cf. *supra* n. 46). One is a Japanese translation, which was in fact written some several decades

<sup>50</sup> The title of the book tells the contents by itself: *Silpa Prakāśa: Medieval Orissan Sanskrit Text on Temple Architecture by Rāmacandra Kaulācāra*, translated and annotated by Alice Boner and Sadāśiva Ratha Śarmā: *Illustrations from the Original Palmleaf Manuscript - Text-Drawings by Sadāśiva Ratha Śarmā / With a preface by V. S. Agrawala* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966), LVII, 166 p. (incl. 19 figs), LXXII ills., 102 p. (Sanskrit text), 1 folded frontisp.

<sup>51</sup> In this connection I would just cite a work which intelligibly covers this question with a glossary of technical terms (p. 85-90) and a bibliography (p. 91-94): Siri Gunasinghe, *La technique de la peinture indienne d'après les textes du Silpa* (= *Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études*, LXII) (Paris: Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale / Presses Universitaires de France, 1957), (viii), 96 p.

<sup>52</sup> See Taisho No. 1419: Vol. XXI, "Preface", p. 936b2; cf. *Hōbōgirin*, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed., p. 266b, "Kufusafu", s.v.).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Walther Heissig, *Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache. Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte* (= *Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen*, II) (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1954), p. 91.

<sup>54</sup> To my regret, I have been unable to see an article on the Tibetan material by Enga TERAMOTO (寺本婉雅: 1870-1940), a pioneer of Japanese Tibetology, "西藏文造像量度經と佛工阿尼哥", 四明餘霞 [a monthly organ of the Tendai Sect], No. 315 (1911).

It is a great pity that a number of philologically interesting and useful shorter articles by Shinten (alias Shirō) SAKAI (酒井真典・紫朗: 1908-1988) are excluded from his collected papers published in 4 volumes: 酒井真典著作集 (京都・法藏館, 1983-87-85-89).

ago.<sup>55</sup> And the other one is an English translation published very recently.<sup>56</sup> To my regret, however, these two otherwise enlightening works must be read with utmost care on certain critical matters. I am afraid that this section for my supplementary notes has gone too far. I will cite only the following two enlightening papers on Indic sources in this genre published by a Japanese scholar.<sup>57</sup>

6.8. It will naturally be endless if one starts looking at architectural surveys of old *vibāras* in connection with the relevant Indic literature, to say nothing of a vast extent of *stūpas* in Asia. There have appeared many interesting works on the *śilpa-vidyā* literature. Recent multilateral field workers have brought out their remarkable achievements, to mention here particularly of Nepal. One always gets a valuable hint or clue from them (cf. also *supra* §3.2 cum n. 37).<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> 逸見梅榮, 造像量度經 (京都・思文閣出版, 1987): handwritten texts bound in 2 volumes in Japanese style: 44 & 62 folios (with a commentary appended by Ryūken SAWA 佐和隆研 on its publication).

<sup>56</sup> *Zaoxiang Liangdu Jing: The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry, with supplement: A Tibetan-Chinese Translation from about 1742 by mGon-po-skyabs (Gömpojab)*. Translated and annotated from this Chinese Translation into modern English by Cai Jingfeng. Introduction and editing assistance by Michael Henss (Ulm: Fabri Verlag, 2000), 143 p. (incl. illus.).

<sup>57</sup> Tadashi SHIMIZU (清水乞 of Tōyō University in Tokyo), “梵文造像量度經注釈概観”, 東洋学研究, VIII (1974), p. 39-52.

---, “シルパ文献における図像資料 (一): 『ルーパマンダナ』を中心として”, 東洋学論叢/東洋大学文学部紀要, XXXIX: 印哲・中哲文篇, XI (1986), p. 47-98.

<sup>58</sup> As an illustration see e.g. Bernhard Kölver, *Re-Building a Stūpa: Architectural Drawings of the Svayambhūnātha* (= *Nepalica*, herausgegeben von B. Kölver und Siegfried Lienhard) (Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag, 1992), 170 p. (incl. 25 illus.).

An architectural survey carried out by the Nippon Institute of Technology, *The Royal Buildings in Nepal: A Report on the Old Royal Palaces of the Kingdom of Nepal* (Miyashiro 1981), 120 p., XLIV plates, 23 folded plates.